Published version: **Quantum Stud.: Math. Found.** (2016) 3:115–122
DOI: 10.1007/s40509-015-0064-4

A Nonlocal Wave-Particle Duality

Mohd Asad Siddiqui · Tabish Qureshi

arXiv:1406.1682v3 [quant-ph] 21 Apr 2016

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

Abstract We propose and analyse a modified ghost-interference experiment, and show that revealing the particle-nature of a particle passing through a double-slit hides the wave-nature of a spatially separated particle which it is entangled with. We derive a *nonlocal duality relation*, $\mathcal{D}_1^2 + \mathcal{V}_2^2 \leq 1$, which connects the path distinguishability of one particle to the interference visibility of the other. It extends Bohr's principle of complementarity to a nonlocal scenario. We also propose a *ghost quantum eraser* in which, erasing the which-path information of one particle brings back the interference fringes of the other.

Keywords Complementarity · Wave-particle duality · Entanglement

1 Introduction

The two-slit interference experiment has become a cornerstone of the issue of wave-particle duality and Bohr's complementarity principle. So beautifully and simply does it capture the dual nature of particles and light and the superposition principle that it has become symbolic of the mysterious nature of quantum mechanics. The fact that the wave and particle nature cannot be observed at the same time, appears to be so fundamental that Bohr elevated it to the level of a new principle, the principle of complementarity[1]. Bohr asserted that if an experiment clearly revealed the particle nature, it would completely hide the wave nature, and vice-versa. This principle has stood its ground in face of several attacks over the years.

Centre for Theoretical Physics, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India. E-mail: tabish@ctp-jamia.res.in

This principle has now been made quantitatively precise by a bound on the extent to which the two natures could be simultaneously observed [2,3]. The extent to which one can distinguish which of the two slits a particle passes through, is given by a quantity $\mathcal{D}$, called the path-distinguishability, quantifying the particle nature. The wave-nature is quantified by the visibility of the interference pattern, given by $\mathcal{V}$. The quantities $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are so defined that they can take values only between 0 and 1. The relation putting a bound on the two is given by the so-called duality relation[3]

$$\mathcal{V}^2 + \mathcal{D}^2 \leq 1. \tag{1}$$

The above relation implies that a full which-path information ($\mathcal{D} = 1$) would definitely wash out the interference pattern completely ($\mathcal{V} = 0$).

It is quite obvious that when we talk of path distinguishability, we talk of the which-path knowledge of the same particle which eventually contributes to the interference pattern. In this sense the duality relation (1) is *local*. In the following we propose and theoretically analyse an experiment involving pairs of entangled particles in which we relate the which-path information of one particle to the fringe visibility of the other.

2 Ghost interference

The starting point of our analysis is the well known ghost-interference experiment carried out by Strekalov et al.[4]. In this experiment, pairs of entangled photons are generated from a spontaneous parametric down conversion (SPDC) source. In the path of photon 1 is kept a double-slit and further down in the path is a *fixed* detector D1. Photon 2 travels undisturbed and is ultimately detected by the movable detector D2. The detectors D1



Fig. 1 A modified ghost-interference experiment with entangled pairs of particles. A which-path detector can detect which of the two slits particle 1 went through. Detector D1 is fixed at $z = 0$, but D2 is free to move along the z-axis.

and D2 are connected to a coincidence counter. In coincident counts, a two-slit interference pattern is seen by detector D2 for photon 2. Note that photon 2 does not pass through any double-slit. This interference was appropriately called ghost interference, and has been understood to be a consequence of entanglement. This experiment generated lot of research attention in subsequent years [5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13]. The photon pairs emerging from an SPDC source are believed to capture the essence of the EPR state [14] introduced by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [15]. The spatial correlations shown by photons emerging from parametric down-conversion are well understood now [16].

Our proposed experiment is shown in Fig.1. Entangled particle pairs emerge from a source S. For the sake of generality, let us assume massive particles, although the ghost interference experiment is done with photons. Particle 1 passes through a double-slit and also interacts with a which-path detector. We do not specify any form of the which-path detector, but just assume that it is a quantum system, initially in a state $|d_0\rangle$. If the particle passes through slit 1, the path detector ends up in the state $|d_1\rangle$, and if it passes through slit 2, the path detector ends up in the state $|d_2\rangle$. In general, when the particle has passed through the double-slit, the two path detector states, $|d_1\rangle$ and $|d_2\rangle$, get entangled with the two paths of particle 1. This entanglement is a must in order that the which-path detector acquires the relevant information about the particle. Particle 1 then travels and reaches a *fixed* detector D1. Particle 2 travels unhindered to the detector D2. As the two particles have to be counted in coincidence, the paths travelled by both the particles, before reaching their respective detectors, are equal. Without the which-path detector, this experiment is just the original ghost interference experiment where particle 2 displays an interference pattern[4].

Essentially we are now looking at the issue of wave-particle duality in a system of entangled particles, a subject not particularly well studied. Wave-particle duality for entangled systems has been studied in a rather generalized formalism by Vaccaro [17].

3 Which-path information

We assumes $|d_1\rangle, |d_2\rangle$ to be normalized, but not necessarily orthogonal. The ultimate limit to the knowledge we can acquire as to which slit particle 1 went through, is set by how distinct the states $|d_1\rangle, |d_2\rangle$ are. If $|d_1\rangle, |d_2\rangle$ are orthogonal, we can *in principle* know with hundred percent accuracy which slit the particle went through. With this thinking we define which-path distinguishability *for particle 1* as

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \sqrt{1 - |\langle d_1|d_2\rangle|^2}. \tag{2}$$

In order to quantify the effect of the which-path detector on the ghost interference shown by particle 2, we carry out a quantum mechanical analysis of the dynamics of the entangled particles. We assume that the particles travel in opposite directions along the x-axis. The entanglement is in the z-direction. The best state to describe momentum-entangled particles is the *generalized EPR state*[18]

$$\Psi(z_1, z_2) = C \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp e^{-p^2/4\hbar^2\sigma^2} e^{-ipz_2/\hbar} e^{ipz_1/\hbar} e^{-\frac{(z_1+z_2)^2}{4\Omega^2}}, \tag{3}$$

where C is a normalization constant, and σ, Ω are certain parameters. In the limit $\sigma, \Omega \to \infty$ the state (3) reduces to the EPR state introduced by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen[14].

After performing the integration over p, (3) reduces to

$$\Psi(z_1, z_2) = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{\pi\Omega}} e^{-(z_1-z_2)^2\sigma^2} e^{-(z_1+z_2)^2/4\Omega^2}. \tag{4}$$

It is straightforward to show that Ω and σ quantify the position and momentum spread of the particles in the z-direction.

We assume that after travelling for a time t_0, particle 1 reaches the double slit ($vt_0 = L_2$), and particle 2 travels a distance L_2 towards detector D2. Using the strategy outlined in the preceding discussion, we can write the state of the entangled photons after a time t_0.

The state of the entangled system, after this time evolution, can be calculated using the Hamiltonian governing the time evolution, given by $\hat{H} = \frac{p_1^2}{2m} + \frac{p_2^2}{2m}$. After

a time t_0, (4) assumes the form

$$\Psi(z_1,z_2,t_0) = C_{t_0}\exp\left[\frac{-(z_1-z_2)^2}{\frac{1}{\sigma^2}+\frac{4i\hbar t_0}{m}} - \frac{(z_1+z_2)^2}{4\Omega^2+\frac{i\hbar t_0}{m}}\right], \tag{5}$$

where $C_{t_0} = \left(\pi(\Omega+\frac{i\hbar t_0}{4m\Omega})(1/\sigma+\frac{4i\hbar t_0}{m/\sigma})\right)^{-1/2}$.

We take into account the effect of the double-slit on the entangled state as follows. We assume that the double-slit allows the portions of the wave-function in front of the slit to pass through, and blocks the other portions. We assume that what emerge from the double-slit are localized Gaussian wavepackets, whose width is the width of the slit. The two slits being A and B, the wavepackets which pass through, are denoted by $|\phi_A(z_1)\rangle$ and $|\phi_B(z_1)\rangle$, respectively. The portion of particle 1 which gets blocked is, say, $|\chi(z_1)\rangle$. These three states are obviously orthogonal, and the entangled two-particle state can be expanded in terms of these. We can thus write:

$$|\Psi(z_1,z_2,t_0)\rangle = |\phi_A\rangle|\psi_A\rangle + |\phi_B\rangle|\psi_B\rangle + |\chi\rangle|\psi_\chi\rangle, \tag{6}$$

where the corresponding states of particle 2 are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_A(z_2)\rangle &= \langle\phi_A(z_1)|\Psi(z_1,z_2,t_0)\rangle\\
|\psi_B(z_2)\rangle &= \langle\phi_B(z_1)|\Psi(z_1,z_2,t_0)\rangle\\
|\psi_\chi(z_2)\rangle &= \langle\chi(z_1)|\Psi(z_1,z_2,t_0)\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In addition, the wavepackets of particle 1 get entangled with the two states of the which-path detector $|d_1\rangle, |d_2\rangle$. So, the state we get after particle 1 crosses the double-slit is:

$$|\Psi(z_1,z_2)\rangle = |d_1\rangle|\phi_A\rangle|\psi_A\rangle + |d_2\rangle|\phi_B\rangle|\psi_B\rangle + |d_0\rangle|\chi\rangle|\Psi_\chi\rangle. \tag{8}$$

The first two terms represent the amplitudes of particle 1 passing through the double-slit, and the last term represents the amplitude of it getting blocked. If the particle 1 gets blocked, the state of the path detector remains what it was initially, i.e., $|d_0\rangle$. Unitarity of the dynamics makes sure that these three parts of the wave-function will evolve independently, without affecting each other. Since we are only interested in situations where particle 1 passes through the slit, we will throw away the term which represents particle 1 not passing through the slits. To do that, we just have to renormalise the remaining part of the wave-function, which looks like

$$|\Psi(z_1,z_2)\rangle = \frac{1}{A}(|d_1\rangle|\phi_A\rangle|\psi_A\rangle + |d_2\rangle|\phi_B\rangle|\psi_B\rangle), \tag{9}$$

where $A = \sqrt{\langle\psi_A|\psi_A\rangle + \langle\psi_B|\psi_B\rangle}$.

In the following, we assume that $|\phi_A\rangle$, $|\phi_B\rangle$, are Gaussian wave-packets:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_A(z_1) &= \frac{1}{(\pi/2)^{1/4}\sqrt{\epsilon}}e^{-(z_1-z_0)^2/\epsilon^2},\\
\phi_B(z_1) &= \frac{1}{(\pi/2)^{1/4}\sqrt{\epsilon}}e^{-(z_1+z_0)^2/\epsilon^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\pm z_0$ is the z-position of slit A and B, respectively, and ϵ their widths. Thus, the distance between the two slits is $2z_0 \equiv d$.

Using (5), (7) and (10), wave-functions $|\psi_A\rangle$, $|\psi_B\rangle$ can be calculated, which, after normalization, have the form

$$\psi_A(z_2) = C_2 e^{-\frac{(z_2-z_0')^2}{\Gamma}}, \quad \psi_B(z_2) = C_2 e^{-\frac{(z_2+z_0')^2}{\Gamma}}, \tag{11}$$

where $C_2 = (2/\pi)^{1/4}(\sqrt{\Gamma_R}+\frac{i\Gamma_I}{\sqrt{\Gamma_R}})^{-1/2}$,

$$z_0' = \frac{z_0}{\frac{4\Omega^2\sigma^2+1}{4\Omega^2\sigma^2-1}+\frac{4\epsilon^2}{4\Omega^2-1/\sigma^2}}, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\Gamma = \frac{\epsilon^2+\frac{1}{\sigma^2}+\frac{\epsilon^2}{4\Omega^2\sigma^2}+\frac{2i\hbar t_0}{m}}{1+\frac{\epsilon^2}{\Omega^2}+\frac{i2\hbar t_0}{4\Omega^2 m}+\frac{1}{4\Omega^2\sigma^2}} + \frac{2i\hbar t_0}{m}. \tag{13}$$

Thus, the state which emerges from the double slit, has the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(z_1,z_2) = {} & c|d_1\rangle e^{\frac{-(z_1-z_0)^2}{\epsilon^2}} e^{\frac{-(z_2-z_0')^2}{\Gamma}}\\
& + c|d_2\rangle e^{\frac{-(z_1+z_0)^2}{\epsilon^2}} e^{\frac{-(z_2+z_0')^2}{\Gamma}},
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $c = (1/\sqrt{\pi\epsilon})(\sqrt{\Gamma_R}+\frac{i\Gamma_I}{\sqrt{\Gamma_R}})^{-1/2}$. Particles travel for another time t before reaching their respective detectors. We assume that the wave-packets travel in the x-direction with a velocity v such that $\lambda = h/mv$ is the de Broglie wavelength. Using this strategy, we can write $\hbar(t+2t_0)/m = \lambda D/2\pi$, $\hbar t_0/m = \lambda L_2/2\pi$. The expression $\lambda D/2\pi$ will also hold for a photon provided, one uses the wavelength of the photon for λ[13]. The state acquires the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(z_1,z_2,t) = {} & C_t|d_1\rangle \exp\left[\frac{-(z_1-z_0)^2}{\epsilon^2+\frac{iL_1\lambda}{\pi}}\right]\exp\left[\frac{-(z_2-z_0')^2}{\Gamma+\frac{iL_1\lambda}{\pi}}\right]\\
& + C_t|d_2\rangle \exp\left[\frac{-(z_1+z_0)^2}{\epsilon^2+\frac{iL_1\lambda}{\pi}}\right]\exp\left[\frac{-(z_2+z_0')^2}{\Gamma+\frac{iL_1\lambda}{\pi}}\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where

$$C_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{\epsilon+iL_1\lambda/\epsilon\pi}\sqrt{\sqrt{\Gamma_r}+(\Gamma_i+iL_1\lambda/\pi)/\sqrt{\Gamma_r}}}. \tag{16}$$

In order to get simplified results, we consider the limit $\Omega \gg \epsilon$ and $\Omega \gg 1/\sigma$. In this limit

$$\Gamma^2 \approx \gamma^2 + 4i\hbar t_0/m, \tag{17}$$

where $\gamma^2 = \epsilon^2 + 1/\sigma^2$ and $z_0' \approx z_0$.

4 Nonlocal wave-particle duality

We are now in a position to calculate the probability of D2 detecting particle 2 at a position z_2, provided that D1, which is fixed at $z_1 = 0$, detects particle 1. This probability density is given by $|\Psi(0, z_2, t)|^2$, which has the following form

$$|\Psi(0,z_2,t)|^2 = \alpha e^{\frac{-2(z_2^2+z_0^2)}{\gamma^2+[\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2}} \cosh\left[\frac{4z_2z_0}{\gamma^2+[\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2}\right] \times \left\{1+|\langle d_1|d_2\rangle|\frac{\cos\left[\frac{4z_2z_0\lambda D\pi}{\gamma^4\pi^2+\lambda^2D^2}\right]}{\cosh\left[\frac{4z_2z_0}{\gamma^2+[\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2}\right]}\right\}, \quad (18)$$

where $\alpha = |C_t|^2 e^{\frac{-2z_0^2}{\epsilon^2+[\frac{\lambda L}{\pi\epsilon}]^2}}$. Eqn. (18) represents a ghost interference pattern for particle 2, even though it has not passed through any double-slit.

We can calculate the fringe visibility of the interference formed by particle 2. Fringe visibility is defined as $\mathcal{V} = \frac{I_{max}-I_{min}}{I_{max}+I_{min}}$, where I_{max}, I_{min} is the maximum and minimum intensity in neighboring region of the interference pattern[19]. The fringe visibility for particle 2, from (18), is given by

$$\mathcal{V}_2 = \frac{|\langle d_1|d_2\rangle|}{\cosh(\frac{4z_2z_0}{\gamma^2+[\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2})}. \quad (19)$$

The visibility of ghost interference has also been derived earlier by Barbosa [20], calculating a fourth order correlation function in the theory of Mandel and coworkers [21]. However, a connection of the visibility of ghost interference to the which-path information for photon 1 has not been studied before.

As $\cosh(\theta) \geq 1$, we can write the inequality

$$\mathcal{V}_2 \leq |\langle d_1|d_2\rangle| \quad (20)$$

Using (2), the above inequality yields

$$\mathcal{D}_1^2 + \mathcal{V}_2^2 \leq 1 \quad (21)$$

The inequality (21) is a very interesting one. It puts a bound on how much which-path information for particle 1 and visibility of interference fringes for particle 2 we can get at the same time. Clearly, full which-path information for particle 1 implies that the interference pattern of particle 2 will be completely washed out.

Bohr's complementarity principle is made quantitatively precise by the inequality (1). However, here we have a curious scenario where complementarity is governing two separated particles which are not even interacting with each other. By virtue of entanglement, their natures are also entwined with each other. Revealing the particle nature of one, hides the wave nature of the other! It appears that in this kind of entangled state, the two particle can either reveal their wave-nature together, or particle nature together.



Fig. 2 Schematic diagram for the proposed *ghost quantum eraser*. Quarter-wave plates in front of the slits encode which-path information into polarization. Horizontal polarizer in front of D1 erases the which-path information of photon 1, and the interference in photon 2 comes back.

5 Ghost quantum eraser

In the preceding section we saw that extracting which-path information in particle 1, leads to disappearance of interference in particle 2. For a conventional two-slit experiment it is well known that if we devise a way to erase the which-path information, it is possible to recover the lost interference. This phenomenon goes by the name of *quantum eraser*[22,23].

In the following we propose a quantum eraser experiment which can be performed with entangled photons. The setup is shown in Fig.(2), and is motivated by a two-slit quantum eraser demonstrated by Walborn et al.[24,25]. Properties of entangled photons have been used to construct quantum eraser earlier [26,27]. Recently quantum eraser has been demonstrated even with thermal light [28]. Our proposal is radically different from all these in that the which-path information and interference is probed, not in the same photon, but in two different photons. The setup consists of a type I SPDC source generating pairs of photons which we call 1 and 2. Type I SPDC source produces pairs of photons which have the same polarization. The source is assumed to include a polarizer which produces photon pairs which are linearly polarized.

The experiment may also be carried out using a type II SPDC source which produces linearly polarized photons with orthogonal polarizations. The requirement is that the two photons should not be polarization-entangled. There is a double-slit in the path of photon 1, followed by a *fixed* detector D1. Photon 2 travels undisturbed to detector D2 which scans various positions, and acts like a screen. The two detectors are connected to a coincidence counter. Behind the double-slit are kept two quarter-wave plates which convert the passing linearly polarized photons to left-circular and right-circular polarizations respectively. This makes the which-path information about photon 1 available to an experimenter. By probing the polarization of the photon detected at D1, the experimenter can know which slit the photon came from.

These orthogonal polarization states of photon 1 play the role of $|d_1\rangle$ and $|d_2\rangle$, as described in the preceding analysis. However, $|d_1\rangle$ and $|d_2\rangle$ are orthogonal in this case. The state of the two photons, when they reach their respective detectors, is given by (15). The coincident probability of detecting photon 2 is given by (18), with $\langle d_1|d_2\rangle = 0$. There will be no interference seen in this situation, which is depicted in the upper diagram of Fig.2.

Next we put a horizontal polarizer in front of D1. This will convert both left- and right-circularly poralized photons to horizontally polarized ones. All the photons reaching D1 now, are horizontally polarized, whether they came from one slit or the other. There is no way now that an experimenter can know which slit photon 1 came from. We have to see what will be the behavior of photon 2 in this situation, by a careful analysis. If the left- and right-circular polarizations are represented by $|d_1\rangle$ and $|d_2\rangle$ respectively, adding the two would give us linear polarization. We introduce a state $|q_1\rangle = (|d_1\rangle + |d_2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ which represents horizontal polarization. The state of the photons which reach D1 (after passing through the horizontal plate) and D2 now, is given by $\langle q_1|\Psi(z_1, z_2, t)\rangle$, where $|\Psi(z_1, z_2, t)\rangle$ is given by (15).

The coincident probability of detecting photon 2 is now given by

$$|\langle q_1|\Psi(0, z_2, t)\rangle|^2 = \frac{\alpha}{2} e^{\frac{-2(z_2^2+z_0^2)}{\gamma^2+[\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2}} \cosh\left[\frac{4z_2 z_0}{\gamma^2 + [\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2}\right] \times \left\{1 + \frac{\cos\left[\frac{4z_2 z_0 \lambda D\pi}{\gamma^4\pi^2+\lambda^2 D^2}\right]}{\cosh\left[\frac{4z_2 z_0}{\gamma^2+[\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2}\right]}\right\}, \quad (22)$$

where $\alpha = |C_t|^2 e^{\frac{-2z_0^2}{\epsilon^2+[\frac{\lambda L}{\pi\epsilon}]^2}}$. The above represents an interference pattern, even in the presence of the quarter-wave plates. The horizontal polarizer has erased the which-path information for photon 1 and the interference for photon 2 has come back. This scenario is depicted in the lower diagram of Fig.2. We call it a ghost quantum eraser because erasing the which-path information in one photon is recovering the interference in its remote, entangled cousin, photon 2.

One can see that the which-path information can also be erased by putting a *vertical* polarizer, instead of a horizontal one. Let us see if one recovers the interference in this case too. The vertical polarization state can be represented by the quantum state $|q_2\rangle = (|d_1\rangle - |d_2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The state of the two photons which reach D1 after passing through the vertical plate, and D2, respectively, is given by $\langle q_2|\Psi(z_1, z_2, t)\rangle$, where $|\Psi(z_1, z_2, t)\rangle$ is given by (15). The coincident probability of detecting photon 2 is now given by

$$|\langle q_2|\Psi(0, z_2, t)\rangle|^2 = \frac{\alpha}{2} e^{\frac{-2(z_2^2+z_0^2)}{\gamma^2+[\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2}} \cosh\left[\frac{4z_2 z_0}{\gamma^2 + [\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2}\right] \times \left\{1 - \frac{\cos\left[\frac{4z_2 z_0 \lambda D\pi}{\gamma^4\pi^2+\lambda^2 D^2}\right]}{\cosh\left[\frac{4z_2 z_0}{\gamma^2+[\frac{\lambda D}{\pi\gamma}]^2}\right]}\right\}. \quad (23)$$

The above expression represents an interference pattern which is almost exactly the same as that in (22), except that it is shifted along the z-axis. The shift is such that the bright fringes of (23) are at the location of the dark fringes of (22).

6 Discussion

We have theoretically analysed a modified ghost-interference setup where a which-path detector for particle 1 has been introduced. Unravelling the particle aspect of photon 1 hides the wave aspect of photon 2. This appears to be a nonlocal extension of Bohr's complementarity principle. We also derive a nonlocal duality relation connecting the which-path distinguishability of particle 1 with the interference fringe visibility of particle 2. Because of entanglement, the wave and particle aspects of the two particles are no longer independent.

We wish to reemphasize again that this proposal should not be confused with certain other experiments, where two-particle correlation is used to infer the which-way information of a particle, which passes through a double-slit[26,27,28]. In those experiments, the wave and particle natures in question are properties of the *same* particle, only that another correlated particle is used to get which-way information of the particle passing through a double-slit *and* showing interference. In our proposal, particle 1 passes though a double-slit and

we use certain which-way detector to know which of the two slits it passed through. Particle 2 *does not pass through any double-slit*, so one cannot even talk about any which-way information for it. However, it does show interference in coincidence with detector D1. So the nonlocal duality relation connects which-way information for particle 1 to interference visibility for particle 2.

We propose a realizable *ghost quantum eraser* experiment. Here erasing the which-path information of one photon recovers the interference for the other photon. The aspects discussed in this investigation reveal highly non-classical and nonlocal features of entangled systems.

Acknowledgments

M.A. Siddiqui thanks the University Grants Commission, India for financial support. Authors thank an anonymous referee for suggesting changes which improved the clarity of the discussion.

References

1. N. Bohr, "The quantum postulate and the recent development of atomic theory," Nature (London) 121, 580-591 (1928).
2. D. M. Greenberger and A. Yasin, "Simultaneous wave and particle knowledge in a neutron interferometer", Phys. Lett. A 128, 391 (1988).
3. B-G. Englert, "Fringe visibility and which-way information: an inequality", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2154 (1996).
4. D.V. Strekalov, A.V. Sergienko, D.N. Klyshko, Y.H. Shih, "Observation of two-photon ghost interference and diffraction," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3600 (1995).
5. M. D'Angelo, Y-H. Kim, S. P. Kulik and Y. Shih, "Identifying Entanglement Using Quantum Ghost Interference and Imaging," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 233601 (2004).
6. S. Thanvanthri and M. H. Rubin, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 063811 (2004).
7. Y-H. Zhai, X-H. Chen, D. Zhang, L-A. Wu, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 043805. (2005).
8. L. Jie, C. Jing, *Chinese Phys. Lett.* **28**, 094203 (2011).
9. J. Kofler, M. Singh, M. Ebner, M. Keller, M. Kotyrba, A. Zeiling er, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 032115 (2012).
10. P. Chingangbam, T. Qureshi, "Ghost interference and quantum erasure," *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **127**, 383-392 (2012).
11. D-S. Ding, Z-Y. Zhou, B-S. Shi, X-B Zou, G-C. Guo, "Two-color ghost interference," *AIP Advances* **2**, 032177 (2012).
12. S. Shafaq, T. Qureshi, "Theoretical analysis of two-color ghost interference," *Eur. Phys. J. D* **68**, 52 (2014).
13. T. Qureshi, P. Chingangbam, S. Shafaq, "Understanding ghost interference," arXiv:1406.0633 [quant-ph]
14. A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, "Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?", *Phys. Rev.* **47** (1935) 777–780.
15. D.N. Klyshko, "A simple method of preparing pure states of an optical field, of implementing the EinsteinPodolsky-Rosen experiment, and of demonstrating the complementarity principle," *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **31**, 74 (1988).
16. S.P. Walborn, C.H. Monken, S. Pádua, P.H. Souto Ribeiro, "Spatial correlations in parametric down-conversion," *Phys. Rep.* **495**, 87-139 (2010).
17. J.A. Vaccaro, "Particle-wave duality: a dichotomy between symmetry and asymmetry," *Proc. R. Soc. A.* **468**, 1065-1084 (2012).
18. T. Qureshi, "Understanding Popper's experiment," *Am. J. Phys.* **73**, 541-544 (2005).
19. M. Born, E. Wolf, "Principles of Optics" (Cambridge University Press, UK, 2002), 7th edition.
20. G.A. Barbosa, "Quantum images in double-slit experiments with spontaneous down-conversion light," *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 4473 (1996).
21. L.J. Wang, X.Y. Zou, L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. A 44, 4614 (1991); X.Y. Zou, L.J. Wang, L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 318 (1991); Z.Y. Ou, L.J. Wang, L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. A 40, 1428 (1989); C.K. Hong L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 58 (1986).
22. E. Jaynes, in *Foundations of Radiation Theory and Quantum Electronics*, ed. A. O. Barut (Plenum, New York 1980), pp. 37.
23. M. O. Scully, B.-G. Englert and H. Walther, *Nature (London)* **351** (1991), 111.
24. S.P. Walborn, M.O. Terra Cunha, S. Pádua, C.H. Monken, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 033818 (2002)
25. S.P. Walborn, M.O. Terra Cunha, S.Pádua, C.H. Monken, "Quantum erasure", *American Scientist* **91**, 336-343 (2003).
26. Y-H Kim, R. Yu, S.P. Kulik, Y. Shih, "Delayed 'Choice' Quantum Eraser," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1 (2000).
27. G. Scarcelli, Y. Zhou, Y. Shih, "Random delayed-choice quantum eraser via two-photon imaging," *Eur. Phys. J. D* **44**, 167-173 (2007).
28. T. Peng, H. Chen, Y. Shih, "Delayed-choice quantum eraser with thermal light," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 180401 (2014).